| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| | 10/603,429 | WANG ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Michael Kahelin | 3762 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: <u>allowable</u> | | |
| (1) <u>Michael Kahelin</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>David Sarisky</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 21 May 2007 | Time: <u>12pm</u> | |
| Type of Interview: Telephonic Video Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No | nt's representative) | |
| If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: NA | | |
| Claims discussed: 3, 19, and 20 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: NA | | |
| Part II. | | , |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: An amendment was proposed by the Examiner to provide antecedent basis for the "comparing the difference" clause, as indicated in the Examiner's Amendment. Applicant agreed to the changes to clarify the claim language. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview | | |
| did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| | • | |
| | | |
| | | |
| - 1NV | | |
| 1/2 /h 5/24/07 | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/ | Applicant's Representative Si | gnature – if approp riate) |